

REMARKS

Claims 1-8; 17-24; and 25-32 were in the case with none of the claims indicated allowable. Claims 9-16 were previously cancelled and currently Claims 1-8 are cancelled and new dependent Claims 33-34 are added.

The preamble of independent Claim 17 is amended to recite that the method includes *operating a combustion system having an electrostatic precipitator (ESP) and a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) system and optimizing ESP function*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Claim 17 is amended to recite *determining if the SCR system is to be bypassed*. Support for this limitation may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Claim 17 is amended to recite *by-passing the SCR system if the SCR system is determined to be by-passed*. Support for this limitation may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Claim 17 is amended to recite *reducing SO₃ formed during combustion to SO₂ to create an SO₃ concentration configured to improve ESP function*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Claim 17 is amended to recite that *residence time in the oxidizing environment is selected to maintain the SO₃ concentration substantially within a range desirable for ESP function*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 10, lines 7-12, and page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

The preamble of independent Claim 25 is amended to recite that the method includes *operating a combustion system having an electrostatic precipitator (ESP) and a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) system*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed. The preamble is amended to delete the recitation of *lowering the acid dewpoint temperature of flue gas*, which is recited in the body of the claim.

Claim 25 is amended to recite *determining if the SCR system is in operation*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Claim 25 is amended to recite *if the SCR system is not in operation*, prior to the step of adjusting the reducing environment.

Claim 25 is amended to recite *SO₃ formed during combustion is reduced to SO₂ by electron addition to create an SO₃ concentration configured to improve ESP function and optimizing ESP function*. Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed.

Support for new dependent Claims 33 and 34 may be found, *inter alia*, on page 12, lines 12-21 of the application as filed

These amendments and cancellations were made without disclaimer in an effort to advance prosecution of the case. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application directed to cancelled and amended subject matter.

Terminal Disclaimer

The Office points out that the terminal disclaimer filed on 30 August 2007 does not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.321 because the signatory was not officially of record in the current case. Applicant thanks the Office for its recognition of this informality. Enclosed herewith is a terminal disclaimer signed by an attorney officially of record in the current case.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

(1) Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,375,949 (“Salooja”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,029,752 (“Cahn”). Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Salooja, and Cahn, in further view of Applicant’s admitted prior art. Alternatively, Claims 2-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Salooja, and Cahn, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,824,441 (Kindig).

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-8, without prejudice, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the present case. As such, the instant rejections are moot.

(2) Claims 17-23 and 25-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Salooja, and Cahn, and the superficially similar technology disclosed by Applicant, in further view of United States Patent No. 4,196,057 (“May”). Alternatively, Claims 17-32 were rejected under Salooja in view of Cahn and Kindig in further view of May.

Applicant respectfully believes that the instantly claimed invention is addressed to problems not found in any of the references and further contains limitations not found in any

arrangement of the references. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that by this amendment and terminal disclaimer, the case is placed in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If, however, if any issue remains unresolved, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed W. Rilee', written in a cursive style.

Edward W. Rilee
Registration No. 31,869
MacCord Mason PLLC
Post Office Box 2974
Greensboro, NC 27402
(336) 273-4422

Date: 17 March 2008
File No.: 7340-011